

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 10 September 2004. Responsive to the rejections made by the Examiner in the Official Action, Claims 1, 2 and 6 – 8 have been amended to clarify the language thereof and Claims 1, 4 and 5 have been further amended to clarify the combination of elements which form the invention of the subject Patent Application. Claim 3 has been canceled by this Amendment.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the specification for containing “awkward phraseology”. The Examiner also objected to the specification under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o) for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter as claimed in Claim 2 because of the term “bored” which was not used in the Specification. The Specification has now been amended to overcome the Examiner’s objections and the term “bored” has been removed from the claims. The amendments incorporated are purely formal in nature and therefore introduces no new matter.

The Examiner also objected to Claims 1, 3 and 6 due to informalities therein. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7 and 8 have been amended to correct the informalities found therein.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Claims 1, 7 and 8 have been amended to correct the language thereof. Thus, it is now believed that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention..

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng (U.S. Patent #4,946,186). However, the Examiner kindly stated that Claims 3 – 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner also stated that Claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 4 and 5 have been amended to include all of the limitations of the base claim, Claim 1, and any intervening Claims, which there were none, the combination of which the Examiner indicated would be allowable. Claim 1 has also been amended to include all of the limitations of Claim 3 therein. Thus, Claim 3 has been effectively rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of

MR957-1368

Application Serial No. 10/631,817

Responsive to Office Action dated 10 September 2004

the base claim, claim 1, and any intervening Claims, which there were none. Thus, Claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon should now be allowable. With respect to the now amended dependent Claim 8, it is believed that this Claim is independently patentably distinct. Claim 8 adds the limitation of two concavely curved locating gaps on a top thereof for acting as stops with respect to the locating protrusion responsive to pivotal movement of the fixing hook on the pivotal element in either of the two opposing directions. That structure is not disclosed by any of the prior art cited by the Examiner.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FOR: ROSENBERG KLEIN & LEE



David I. Klein  
Registration #33,253

Dated: 22 Nov. 2004

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive  
Suite 101  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
(410) 465-6678